

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report  
For CDRU # 735 Case file # 95-286722.

Material Examiner: Malone (RQ)

Remarks:

Case resulted in a guilty plea, no testimony transcript.

CRM - 4167

# INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fiber

Review commenced at: 11:00 AM (Time), 11/05/01 (Date)

File #: 95-286722

Laboratory #(s): 90206045  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed	Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: Not available

Testimony Date(s): \_\_\_\_\_ Pages: \_\_\_\_\_

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number:	<u>90206045</u>	Date:	<u>Mar 15, 1989</u>
Laboratory Number:	_____	Date:	_____
Laboratory Number:	_____	Date:	_____

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician

Laboratory Number: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Page 1 of 3

Initials: SR

**CRM - 4168**

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letter dated 1-27-89

### Results of Review

File #: 95-286722

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q3

#### Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?  
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?  
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

#### Review of Testimony:

**Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses**

XX ☐ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SMA

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.  
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95-286722

#1: It appears that the unidentified technician performed much of the examination, such as physical description, microscopic examination and solubility testing of the fibers, instead of RQ.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated and are in pencil and not ink. The spectra are not properly labeled. Sufficient testing was performed to support the reported conclusion.

Review completed at: 11:30 AM (Time), 11/05/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.50 hr.

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

  
(Signature)

11/05/2001  
(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: 